A STUDY OF VALUES AMONG SELECTED SECONDARY TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS AS RELATED TO SUCCESS CRITERIA

APPROVED:

Graduate Committee:

Darrell R. Bushong
Major Professor

William Kaufman
Minor Professor

J. Allan Turner
Committee Member

Wyatt L. Black
Committee Member

Duane Kingery
Dean of the School of Education

Robert B. Toulouse
Dean of the Graduate School

A STUDY OF VALUES AMONG SELECTED SECONDARY TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS AS RELATED TO SUCCESS CRITERIA

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Graduate Council of the North Texas State University in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

By

Charlie D. Nichols, B. S., M. A.

Denton, Texas

May, 1969

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Educational researchers have been concerned with the impact of teachers' values in the classroom. The values of an individual teacher may exert a greater influence than is presently known. These values may be subtle determinants of the scope and depth of what students learn and internalize. Arthur Combs asserts that "Teaching is a profession dependent upon human values . . ." (11, p. 75). This statement is representative of many others concerning the importance of values of teaching (15, p. 65; 27, p. 258). Although the extent to which values are related to teaching success is not thoroughly understood, many assume that a positive correlation exists (19, 16). It was believed that a study designed to assess the values of experienced teachers would make a significant contribution in this area.

Statement of the Problem

This was a study of the personal values of selected secondary teachers and principals as related to (1) the principals' evaluations of teacher success, (2) years of teaching experience and (3) level of educational preparation.

Purpose of the Study

The purposes of the study were as follows:

1. To determine the relationship of principals' evaluations of success of selected secondary teachers to the personal values held by these teachers. The following two instruments providing three rating categories and six measures of values were employed:

   a. The Northwestern Teacher Evaluation Form which provided these three teacher success scores:
      (1) Professional Competencies (twelve items)
      (2) Relationships with Others (two items)
      (3) Personal Traits and Qualities (ten items)
      (Hereafter referred to as success scores.)

   b. The Vernon-Allport-Lindzey Study of Values which provided these six scores of personal values:
      (1) Theoretical--The dominant interest of the theoretical man is the discovery of truth.
      (2) Economic--The economic man is characteristically interested in what is useful.
      (3) Aesthetic--The aesthetic man sees his highest value in form and harmony.
      (4) Social--The highest value for this type is love of people.
      (5) Political--The political man is interested in power.

(6) Religious--The highest value of the religious man may be called unity (2, pp. 4-5). (Hereafter referred to as value scores.)

2. To determine if a significant difference exists in the principals' value scores and the value scores of teachers rated in the top third of the success scores.

3. To determine if a significant difference exists in the principals' value scores and the value scores of teachers in the lower third of the success scores.

4. To determine if a significant difference exists in value scores of teachers with a bachelor's degree and teachers with a master's degree.

5. To determine if a significant difference exists in the success scores of teachers with a bachelor's degree and teachers with a master's degree.

6. To determine if a significant difference exists in value scores of teachers when grouped according to years of experience, comparing the group in the top third to the group in the lower third.

7. To determine if a significant difference exists in success criteria ratings of teachers when grouped according to years of experience, comparing the group in the top third to the group in the lower third.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were applied to each of the twenty-four items and the three teacher success scores which comprise the success criteria:

1. There will be a significant positive relationship between selected secondary teachers' Theoretical value scores and the success criteria.

2. There will be a significant negative relationship between selected secondary teachers' Economic value scores and the success criteria.

3. There will be no significant relationship between selected secondary teachers' Aesthetic value scores and the success criteria.

4. There will be a significant positive relationship between selected secondary teachers' Social value scores and the success criteria.

5. There will be no significant relationship between selected secondary teachers' Political value scores and the success criteria.

6. There will be no significant relationship between selected teachers' Religious value scores and the success criteria.

The following hypotheses were formulated for the remaining purposes:

7. There will be no significant differences in each of the mean value scores of teachers rated in the top third on

the three success categories when compared to each of the mean value scores of principals.

8. There will be significant differences in each of the mean value scores of teachers rated in the lower third on the three success categories when compared to each of the mean value scores of principals.

9. There will be significant differences in each of the mean value scores of teachers with bachelor's degrees when compared to the mean value scores of teachers with master's degrees.

10. There will be significant differences in each of the means of the three success scores when teachers with bachelor's degrees are compared to teachers with master's degrees.

11. There will be significant differences in each of the mean value scores of teachers grouped according to years of experience, comparing top third to lower third.

12. There will be significant differences in each of the means of the success scores of teachers grouped according to years of experience, comparing top third to lower third.

Background and Significance of the Study

The importance of values is evident when one recognizes that individual behavior is guided by a system of values (12, 29). Values become even more important when a person is in a position to affect significantly the values of young people. Some authorities believe that a teacher has an impact on

students' values whether he intends to or not. Brubacher contends that:

> Even a teacher who is ignorant of or rejects the terms value and philosophy of life has nevertheless explicit impact on pupils in terms of what he believes in. Though he has not examined what he believes and has no plan to introduce it into the teaching situation, he acts out of his pattern on belief (8, pp. 128-129).

Joyce (20) holds that a teacher's beliefs, values, and attitudes will determine the conduct and emotional climate of his class. Willard (34, pp. 45-46) also feels that those values which are dominant for an individual will determine his beliefs and actions and direct the use of his skills abilities, and energies. Willard conducted a study which indicated that teachers who valued such items as helpfulness, workmanship, security, and freedom also provided their children with a wider and richer range of learning experiences. It was concluded that the type of environment and learning experiences provided under a teacher's guidance are dependent upon the teacher's values.

The extent to which teachers' values influence their teaching has not been ascertained. This can be partly attributed to the paucity of research on the subject. This area of research deserves more attention. Perkins, in his review of research relating to values, similarly concludes that "there is need for critical formulation of the value problem in relation to education as a basis for urgently needed systematic research in this important area" (25, p. 236).

Guy, Spalding, and Westcott maintain that development of adequate teacher education programs require recognition and definition of value patterns in the educative process (18, p. 12). There is particular concern about the role values play in the teaching-learning process. This concern seems to be premised on the assumption that a teacher's values influence his behavior (22, 5, 6, 12). Simon believes that values definitely affect teaching success. He states that:

> . . . an individualized set of values seems to dominate the success of teachers who have that zest, that purpose, and that electric excitement which makes a classroom a rewarding place to be. It is in these classrooms that one senses teachers are doing what they value and valuing what they are doing (30, p. 125).

Brubacher, Childs, Corey (8, 10, 13) and others suggest the extensive influence that teachers' values have in the learning process. Examination of the literature, however, reveals that most research attempting to relate values to teaching success has focused on student teachers. Very few have attempted to assess values of experienced teachers although many assume a concomitant relationship between values and success in teaching exists (9, 17, 21, 34).

It is significant to note that only one study has attempted to find significant correlations between values and teaching success. This investigation was conducted by Seagoe (28) in 1941 and covered a very small population. Another shortcoming of the research was that the Study of Values test was administered two years before the first rating of success was made.

The study did produce enough relevant evidence that Seagoe recommended further research using a larger population.

More recent investigations (1966) which employed the Study of Values as an instrument of research were by White (33) and Briggs (7). Both studies concerned student teachers and revealed no significant correlations between the value areas and student teaching success or behavorial patterns.

White made the following observation and recommendation as a result of his investigation:

> The values of professional teachers need to be assessed and their relationship to professional teaching success determined. Data obtained from such studies might be used to develop teacher education programs designed to help student teachers develop values which are related to teaching success (33, p. 58).

He further observed that his study probably found no significant relationships because of an inadequately developed value system on the part of the student teachers which would directly affect their teaching. It was concluded that these values are reflected in the teaching process only after sufficient experience has accrued and these values are meaningfully related to teaching.

Briggs attempted to determine if significant differences in values, as measured by Study of Values, existed between four student teacher groups who exhibited four different major patterns of teacher behavior. No significant relationships between student teacher values and teaching behavior was found.

A recommendation was made that a follow-up study, similar to Seagoe's might be productive.

Most research studies concerned with student teachers have simply described the values for both sex and teaching specialty subgroups. A few studies have found positive and negative relationships between values and instruments designed to predict teaching success. Conclusions and recommendations by Seagoe, White, Briggs and others seem to point logically to the need for an assessment of values of experienced teachers as related to teaching success.

Most educators would agree on the significance of a teacher's values in the teaching process. Some research findings substantiate the relevance that values have in the teacher's selection of meaningful learning experiences for students (5, 34). A teacher's failure to provide certain experiences because they are inconsistent with his value system could hinder his success as a teacher. This aspect should not be ignored by educators.

Most school districts have some kind of rating system for evaluating their teachers. A means of identifying characteristic values of successful teachers is needed. Instruments and norms based on valid research is more and more in demand as the profession attempts to establish standards to guide selection and performance of its membership. Getzels and Jackson in the Handbook of Research on Teaching assess the Study of Values as an instrument for this purpose:

> Research with the Study of Values suggests that significant differences in values exist between teachers in different subject-matter areas. Indeed, some of these differences invite additional exploration. Further, there is evidence that in at least two of the areas--Economic and Social--teachers as a group, might be distinguished from the general population. Despite these differences between teacher groups and population norms, the usefulness of this instrument for discriminating between good and poor teachers on the criterion of classroom performance still needs to be established (17, pp. 526-527).

Thus the adequacy of the instrument to discriminate between good and poor teachers was in question. It was felt the principals' evaluation of teachers can serve as adequate criteria in distinguishing characteristics values of successful teachers. Further, this type of study can provide valuable additional information on teacher values as they relate to experience and academic preparation.

Findings might be used as a basis for constructing norms for use in teacher selection, in making teaching assignments, and organizing inservice training programs. The information may also prove useful in teacher education programs in colleges and universities if highly rated teachers are revealed as having a common value orientation.

Definition of Terms

The following terms were defined for purposes of this study:

1. Teacher--a fully certified teacher who operates in a classroom setting.

2. Values--for purposes of this study, values are considered to be the motive qualities of personality which serve as standards for decision making and specifically refer to the six measures of values in Study of Values (2, p. 3).

3. Success Scores--referring to the three success categories on the Northwestern Teacher Evaluation Form (Professional Competencies, Relationships with Others, Personal Traits and Qualities).

Limitations of the Study

This study was limited to the extent the instruments used measured values and teacher success.

Basic Assumptions

The following assumptions applied to the study:

1. The teachers and principals participating in the study were conscientious and honest in completing the Values instrument.

2. The combined evaluations of the principal and his assistant provide an accurate rating of teacher success.

3. The rating instrument used in the study provided adequate items and categories for assessing teacher success.

Procedure for Collecting Data

The sample population was selected from five independent school districts located in the North Central Texas area. The criteria in selecting these districts were (1) amenability to

research, (2) scholastic population between 3,000 and 30,000, and (3) at least one high school classified 3A in size by the Texas Interscholastic League.

A total of fifteen secondary schools was chosen from the five school districts. The particular schools used in each district were chosen by coin toss when a choice was possible. For example, the smallest district used in the study had only one high school and one junior high school. Both were included in the study since no bias could influence their selection. In the other four districts a coin toss was used when applicable to select the participating schools. The final selection included five senior high schools (grades 10-12) and ten junior high schools (grades 7-9). The number of schools selected from each district corresponded to their relative size. More specifically, five schools were selected from the largest district, four from the next largest, and so on in that pattern. The exception to this formulation was the use of only one school in the next to the smallest district in which only one high school existed. Inability to get assurances of a valid rating of teacher success precluded using the high school. Subsequently two high schools were selected from the largest district which had a total of four senior high schools.

Only secondary schools which had principals with at least one assistant principal were included in the study. Where more than one assistant principal was assigned to a school, the

assistant was selected whose administrative function and experience could provide the most valid rating of the teachers.

Fifteen principals and fifteen assistant principals in all took the Study of Values test. Subsequently, they completed the rating form for each of the twenty teachers on their particular staff who were selected for the study. The following instructions were emphasized to the principal and assistant principal:

(a) The evaluations or ratings were to be made independently.

(b) The teacher being rated was to be adequately observed in classroom performance by the principal at least twice prior to completion of the rating form.

(c) The teachers' responses on the Study of Values were to remain anonymous.

(d) Instructions on the use of the teacher rating form were to be given.

The twenty teachers from the staffs of the fifteen schools were randomly selected in the following manner: An alphabetized list of the members of each school's teaching staff was compiled. The list was then numbered consecutively and twenty names were selected by using a table of random numbers (32, pp. 280-281). When feasible a date and time before or after school was set for administering the Study of Values to the twenty selected teachers. In some instances this

procedure was not possible because a large number of those selected had duties precluding their presence, i.e., bus driving, hall duty, detention hall duty. Rather than re-select substitutes to take the Values test, it was decided to administer the instrument at a time convenient to the originally selected participants. All participants were asked not to discuss the nature of the test until all other participating teachers on the staff had completed it. Despite these modifications in testing procedures some teachers still were not available due to various reasons such as illness, resignation, etc. This resulted in 284 teachers being used in the study.

Certain procedures were used to protect the anonymity of those participating in the study. Each principal and assistant principal was assigned a code consisting of a letter and a number (A_1, A_2; B_1, B_2; etc.). A combination of this code and a teacher number (A_1 - 16; A_2 - 16; B_1 - 4; B_2 - 4; etc.) was used for the evaluation form. The test instruments were coded prior to selection of the participants. The teacher eventually completed that test instrument and the principal and assistant principal each completed the rating form with the corresponding number. The two evaluations on each teacher were averaged and the resultant success scores were used in the statistical computations.

A brief explanation of the purposes of the research was given to the teachers. They were assured of anonymity. A

data sheet attached to the test booklet requested this additional information:

(a) Number of years teaching experience, counting the current school term as one year.

(b) Highest degree held.

The rating forms and test instruments were completed by fifteen participating school staffs during the last two months of the fall semester, 1968-69. The Values test booklets were then handscored by the researcher and each of the six value scores for each participant was transcribed for use by the computer. The two evaluation forms on each teacher was averaged item by item. Each item score and the total score for the three separate categories were also transcribed for use by the computer in the statistical analysis.

Instruments Used in this Study

Two instruments were used in this study, the Study of Values and an evaluation form which was devised at Northwestern University.

1. The Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values is an untimed, self-administering and self-scoring paper and pencil test designed to "measure the relative prominence of six basic interests or motives in personality" (2, p. 3). It was originally published in 1931 and has been revised periodically since that time. The basic interests or motives are essentially the same as the ideal value types of man as described by

Spranger (31, pp. 109-246), whose work provided the philosophical foundation for the test instrument.

Allport makes the following remarks concerning the ideal value types:

> The typology is one of pure values, not of actual persons. The term ideal type is used in this connection. The label does not mean that the types are necessarily good, or that they are even found in their pure form. An ideal type is rather a "schema of comprehensibility"--a gauge by which we can tell how far a given person has gone in organizing his life by one, or more, of these basic schemes (1, p. 297).

The instrument has two parts. The first part consists of thirty statements or questions with two alternative answers to which the subject indicates his preferences with a three-point scoring system. The second part consists of fifteen situations or statements with four answers or attitudes which are to be ranked in order. The scores are then plotted on a chart which indicates a profile of the relative positions of the individual's values. Norms for the instrument have been established on 5,894 male and 2,475 female college students. The test is constructed so that a score of forty is the average score for any given value. A flat profile would indicate an individual favored all six values equally. Only the larger peaks, or depressions in a profile, however, are significant. Further, the instrument does not measure the absolute strength of each of the six values, but only their relative strength. A high score on one value is obtained only by a corresponding reduction in one or more of the other values.

2. The Northwestern Teacher Evaluation Form was chosen because of its established validity and reliability (33). It was designed to measure teachers' (a) professional competencies, (b) relationships with others and (c) personal traits and qualities. It consists of only twenty-four items, each of which contains five statements. The administrator or supervisor checks the statement under each item which is most descriptive of the teacher under his supervision. These statements are numbered one through five. A score of one represents the lowest evaluation and five represents the highest. The reliability of the instrument was established on ninety-three supervisors and supervising teachers participating in a study for one semester at George Peabody College. The Pearson Product-Moment Correlation of .91 was obtained by the split half technique. The correlation was then entered into the Spearman Brown Prophecy Formula and yielded an r = .95. A statistical validity check was performed on the instrument also. A product-moment correlation coefficient was computed between the total evaluations of the ninety-three college supervisors and supervising teachers. A correlation coefficient of r = .54 resulted. The form is considered valid in that the items represent competencies and personal traits and qualities which most educators would agree are important for successful teaching (29, p. 33).

Procedures for Treating Data

Each research hypothesis, if not already so stated, was stated in the null for statistical testing. The Pearson Product-Moment Coefficient formula for finding r, a simple correlational analysis, was used to test the six hypotheses of the first stated purpose (24, p. 112). Hotelling's T^2 test, an analysis of variance technique for testing the difference between two groups on several measures, was applied to the hypotheses for the second, third, fourth, and sixth purposes of the study (4, p. 101). A Fisher's t test was applied to the fifth and seventh hypotheses and also for the previously stated purposes when a significant variance was evident. The .05 level of confidence was used throughout the study.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Allport, Gordon W., Pattern and Growth in Personality, New York, Holt, Rhinehart and Winston, Inc., 1961.

2. Allport, Gordon W., Phillip E. Vernon and Gardner Lindzey, Manual: Study of Values, Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1960.

3. _____, Study of Values, Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1960.

4. Anderson, T. W., An Introduction to Multivariate Statistical Analysis, New York, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958.

5. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, "Convictions, Beliefs and Values," Perceiving, Behaving, Becoming, 1962 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Washington, D. C., Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, XIII (1962), 199.

6. Bowie, Lucile B. and Gerthon Morgan, "Personal Values and Verbal Behavior of Teachers," The Journal of Experimental Education, XXX (June, 1962), 337-345.

7. Briggs, Kenneth R., "Student Teacher Values and Behavior Patterns," unpublished doctoral dissertation, School of Education, North Texas State University, Denton, Texas, 1966.

8. Brubacher, John, editor, The Public Schools and Spiritual Values, Seventh Yearbook of the John Dewey Society, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1944.

9. Boros, Oscar Krisen, editor, The Sixth Mental Measurements Yearbook, Highland Park, New Jersey, The Gryphon Press, 1965.

10. Childs, J. L., Education and Morals, New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1950.

11. Combs, Arthur W., The Professional Education of Teachers, Boston, Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1965.

12. Combs, Arthur W. and Donald Snygg, Individual Behavior, New York, Harper and Row, 1959.

13. Corey, Fay L., Values of Future Teachers, New York, Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University Press, 1955.

14. Cooley, William W. and Paul R. Lohnes, Multivariate Procedures for the Behavioral Sciences, New York, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962.

15. Educational Policies Commission, Moral and Spiritual Values in the Public Schools, Washington, D. C., National Education Association, 1951.

16. Foshay, Arthur W. and Max R. Goodson, "Some Reflections on Cooperative Action Research," Issues in Curriculum Development, edited by Marvin D. Alcorn and James M. Linley, New York, World Book Company, 1959, pp. 348-356.

17. Gage, N. L., Handbook of Research on Teaching, A Project of the American Educational Research Association, A Department of the National Educational Association, Chicago, Rand McNally and Company, 1963.

18. Guy, George V., Willard B. Spalding and Howard E. Westcott, "The Role of Values in Teacher Education," The Journal of Teacher Education, XII (March, 1961), 12-17.

19. Hartford, Ellis Ford, Moral Values in Education, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1958.

20. Joyce, Bruce, "An Orientation Toward Values in Teacher Education," The Journal of Teaching Education, XII (December, 1961), 463-465.

21. Kearney, Nolan C., A Teacher's Professional Guide, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1958.

22. Krathwohl, David R., Benjamin S. Bloom and Bertram B. Masiz, Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: The Classification of Educational Goals, New York, David McKay Company, Inc., 1964.

23. Maslow, A. H., Motivation and Personality, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1954.

24. McNemar, Quinn, Psychological Statistics, New York, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1965.

25. Perkins, Theodore F., "Research Relating to the Problem of Values," California Journal of Elementary Education, XXIII (May, 1955), 236.

26. Rupiper, Omer John, "A Psychometric Evaluation of Experienced Teachers," The Journal of Educational Research, LV (May, 1962), 369-371.

27. Rugg, Harold O., The Great Technology, New York, John Day Company, 1933.

28. Seagoe, May V., "Prediction of In-Service Success in Teaching," Journal of Educational Research, XXXIX (May, 1946), 658-663.

29. Shane, Harold G. and E. T. McSwain, Evaluation and the Elementary Curriculum, New York, Holt, Rhinehart and Winston, 1958.

30. Simon, Sidney, "Value Development: A High Sense of Individualization," Concern for the Individual in Student Teaching, Forty-second Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching, Part II, Dubuque, Iowa, William C. Brown Company, Inc., 1963.

31. Spranger, Eduard, Types of Men, translated by P. J. V. Pigors, Halle, Max Niemeyer, 1928.

32. Walker, Helen M. and Joseph Lev, Elementary Statistical Methods, New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1958.

33. White, Jack, "The Relationship Between Values and Success in Student Teaching," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Education, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1966.

34. Willard, Ruth A., "A Study of Relationship Between the Valued-Behaviors of Selected Teachers and the Learning Experiences Provided in Their Classrooms," Journal of Educational Research, IL (September, 1958), 45-51.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The literature related to this study is presented under three headings: Definition of Values, Values and Teaching Success, and Evaluating Teacher Effectiveness. The theoretical nexus of the present study are found in these areas.

Definition of Values

A study designed primarily to assess "values" of necessity needs to be concerned with the applicability and definition of the term. To provide a general foundation for such a discussion, the literature dealing with personal values was explored. No generally accepted definition of values was found. Many writers took different approaches to structuring a definition. It was felt that a brief discussion of the characteristics of values common to most definitions would suffice.

Abraham Maslow views values basically as needs (36, pp. 6-7). These needs are generally described as those personality characteristics when absent breed illness, when present prevent illness, and when restored cure illness. These are preferred by deprived persons over other satisfactions under certain free choice situations. This health concept of the character of a need underlies Maslow's understanding of values and the constitutional basis and hierarchial nature

of values (35, p. 4). According to this view, values are biologically based and partly hereditary in origin (36, p. 136).

Maslow discusses values as a hierarchy in terms of an order of priority or strength (37, p. 123). He feels that "the chief principle of organization in human motivational life is the arrangement of needs in a hierarchy of less or greater priority or potency" (36, p. 107). When a person's basic needs are satisfied, the person has strength and appetite to assume satisfaction of higher levels of needs. It is this constant pursuit of need gratification that dominates an individual's life. His progress and achievement can be measured against the relative success he is enjoying at his level of development (36, p. 83).

Contrary to Maslow's concomitant association of values and needs, Ginsburg believes that values

> . . . are not simply derived from needs, appetites, or interests, all of which necessarily involve valuation but are not values. They come into play, or are actualized, when choices are open to the individual which are not decided simply on the basis of need . . . (23, p. 554).

Ginsburg further states that "values are preference statements which are related to generalized notions, principles, or conceptual constructs for which we use the noun 'a value'" (23). He more specifically defines a value as "a criterion which helps us to distinguish between alternatives." Thus this concept of values can be viewed as enabling the individual to recognize himself in relation to the rest of the world (22, p. 446).

Eduard Spranger believes that values are based upon mental laws built into the individual (55, pp. 109-246). His book, Types of Men, provided Vernon, Allport and Lindzey with the theoretical bases for their Study of Values. Spranger concluded that values are interests, attitudes, or dispositions to act which influence the character and behavior of the individual. The direction of one's whole life as well as specific acts are manifestations of the individual's value orientation.

Allport has defined a value as "a belief upon which a man acts by preference. It is thus a cognitive, a motor, and, above all, a deeply propriate [sic] disposition (1, p. 454). Consequently he believes that the shaping of an individual's future is inextricably tied to his values. This belief may explain why he uses such terms as "interest" and "interest system" in discussing personal values, because a person tends to build his future around his interests. The logic of this position seems more apparent when his "interest system" is defined:

> . . . a tensional condition that may be readily aroused, leading to overt conduct in some way satisfying to the interest, but it also acts as a silent agent for selecting and directing any behavior related to it (2, p. 201).

Raths is less specific in defining values. He speaks of a value as implying "prizing and cherishing," and recurrent choosing after deliberation. A value penetrates a person's

life, and the individual reveals his values in making decisions about his life (46, p. 24).

Paschal speaks of values as being organized into a single system, the nucleus of which is the person's valuation of himself. There is usually some consistency among what a person believes, feels, and does. A person uses his resources and organizes his life patterns in a manner compatible to his values. Paschal explains that values are forever undergoing changes, however, due to constant testing, reflection and reappraisal (42).

Values as differentiations of a generic character affecting perception and consequent behavior are described by Combs and Snygg:

> Once established, . . . values have intimate effects upon perceiving. Indeed, the peculiar patterns imposed upon perception by . . . values produce much of the uniqueness of behavior we have come to describe as the individual's personality (18, p. 108).

Scott equates values with moral ideals which the individual uses to assess the "goodness" or "badness," the "rightness" or "wrongness" of actual relationships that he observes or contemplates. This might be described as the popular conception which the layman has of the term (53, p. 3).

The preceding discussion is a sample of the multiplicity of definitions ascribed to values. It is obvious that a generally accepted, all-inclusive definition would be verbose if not impossible. Rather, it was the purpose of

this discussion to establish the relative value construct of the present study. Thus values can be termed abstract concepts. They seem to be related to objects or goals and interests and desires. Values seem to be directed toward objects or goals in so far as they are used as criteria or standards for choosing objects or goals. Also, values appear to be expressions of needs, interests, and desires. And values can be viewed not only as expressions of needs, interests and desires; but they are also expressed by them.

Values and Teaching Success

Many research studies have examined various personality characteristics of teachers and teacher candidates. Several studies used the Study of Values to examine the values of teachers, student teachers or future teachers and attempted to determine relationships between their values and teaching success. A summation of research relevant to the present study follows.

Gowan (24) computed correlation coefficients between the scores of 240 education students on the Study of Values and their scores on two teacher prognosis scales. These scales were derived from the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory. None of the coefficients exceeded .25. The Social and Aesthetic value scores did show significant positive correlations with the teacher prognosis scales ($r = .21$ and $.25$, respectively). The Economic value showed a significant

negative correlation (r = -.25) (24, p. 8). In another study, Gowan (25) had compared responses of a small select group of outstanding elementary teachers on various instruments to a general norm group and a control group. The results showed the Values inventory to have little dicriminatory power among the groups. The criterion or select group, however, was less Aesthetic on the value scale than the other two groups. Gowan's correlational findings in the first instant are similar to those reported by Seagoe in an earlier study.

A direct use of the Study of Values as an instrument to discriminate between successful and unsuccessful teachers was made by Seagoe (54) in 1941. The value scores of thirty-one teaching candidates were correlated with ratings of their student teaching success made two years later. Principals' ratings on twenty-five of these students were also collected two years after their graduation and correlated with their original value scores. In this study a two-year and four-year lapse was allowed between the administration of the Study of Values and the collection of teacher-success ratings. The correlation coefficients reported by Seagoe were low. Economic and Aesthetic values revealed the highest correlations with success ratings. Economic values corresponded negatively (r = -.33) with student teaching success and Aesthetic values correlated positively (r = .26) with success as a professional

teacher. Neither value area, however, showed a consistent relationship with both success criteria (54, p. 166).

Another attempt to relate values to teaching success was made by Tanner (57, pp. 273-274). The primary purpose of the study was to compare the personality characteristics of superior and inferior teachers as measured by objective personality tests. This was done by comparing the responses of two groups of future teachers on several personality instruments. The two groups of future teachers were labeled "superior" and "inferior" on the basis of faculty evaluations and responses on the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory. The Study of Values was one of the instruments used in this research. The superior women were significantly lower on Economic and higher on Social values than were the inferior women. For both sexes inferior teachers were higher on the Economic scale when their mean score was compared to superior teachers. There was no apparent differences in the value scores for superior and inferior men teachers.

As a result of this investigation, Tanner recommended that future studies concerned with personality characteristics of teachers look for significant mean differences rather than significant correlation coefficients. Although some superior and inferior teachers answered certain items the same on various inventories, there were significant differences in the direction of the responses by the two groups (57, p. 274).

A specific objective of Bowie and Morgan (12), was to compare aspects of teacher verbal statements with teacher value systems, those "interests or motives in personality" as measured by Study of Values (3, p. 3). The study revealed differences in verbal behavior and value systems of the teachers observed. It was recommended, as a result of the findings, that further research investigate factors related to the differences.

The purpose of a study by Rupiper (49) was to determine the scholastic aptitude, personality traits and interests of experienced teachers pursuing advanced degrees in education. The Study of Values was one of the standardized instruments administered to the graduate students used in the study. Although no tests of significance were determined and no dominant patterns existed for the groups, comparison of mean value scores revealed that men were higher on the Aesthetic value than women. The women had higher Theoretical and Economic value means, however, when compared to the men. Rupiper concluded from the overall findings of the study that teachers were not essentially different from people in general (49).

Two studies were concerned with the relation of teachers' responses to the Study of Values and the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory. Billingsly (10) compared a "gifted" group of teachers with a typical group. The result of his study showed no significant difference in the scores of the

two groups on the two instruments. The Aesthetic value, however, was isolated for the gifted group of teachers, but not for the typical group. In the other study Riccio and Peters (47) compared the performance of 365 women and 123 men teacher education students on the same two instruments. They found only two of the six correlation coefficients (Aesthetic, r = .13; Political, r = .14) were significantly different from zero. These were so small as to be viewed as negligible on a practical basis. These studies indicate little apparent relationship between elements measured by the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory and the individual scales of the Study of Values.

There are few definite conclusions that can be made from the several studies cited. It does appear that the only consistent value score pointing toward a significant difference is the Economic value (24, 54, 57). Less effective teachers seem to have a higher Economic value orientation. One study (49) indicated that women teachers generally had higher Economic and Theoretical values than men teachers, but men were higher on the Aesthetic value. There was some indication that high Social (24, 57) and Aesthetic (24, 10, 54, 47) value areas might distinguish effective teachers from less effective ones. One study (25), however, did present contradictory findings regarding the Aesthetic value.

The inconsistent findings of the various studies can be attributed to several factors. The sample population in

several studies was too small to be representative and therefore conclusions are not applicable to broad generalization. The populations tested were not typically alike making comparison of results difficult. There were also differences in research methodology and technique. Several studies looked for significant correlations of the value areas with indirect measures of teaching success such as teacher prognosis instruments. Others used mean score comparisons and/or differing criteria for determining teacher success. The most significant conclusion is that the paucity of research on teacher values leaves many questions unanswered. All of which points up the need for a broad-based assessment of teacher's values and the relationship these values have to teacher success.

Evaluating Teacher Effectiveness

Much has been written on the subject of evaluating teacher effectiveness, but findings to date are inconclusive and incomplete. There is even little agreement on how to go about determining effectiveness. Biddle and Ellena put the problem in perspective:

> Probably no aspect of education has been discussed with greater frequency, with as much deep concern, or by more educators and citizens than has that of teacher effectiveness . . . (9, p. v).

A review of literature reveals that many techniques have been used in an attempt to measure teaching success. These have included administrative ratings, peer ratings, student ratings, self-ratings, observational analyses ratings,

and indexes of student behavioral changes (13). A brief discussion of the various difficulties and approaches to assessing teaching success will provide prospective for the present study.

Barr presents (7) four approaches which may serve as guides to research on teacher effectiveness: (1) evaluation of the teacher's performance by observing classroom behavior, (2) the evaluation of the degree to which a teacher possesses the intellectual attributes associated with effective teaching, (3) evaluation of the degree a teacher possesses necessary personality characteristics, and (4) evaluation of pupil change.

Mitzel (40, pp. 35-36) offers other suggestions for organizing productive research. He proposes that there has to be a further refinement of systematic observation tools. He refers to the "need to identify the dimensions of behavior which have maximum relevance to the problem." This specifically means a systematic study of teachers' classroom behavior and corresponding change in students. A further step is to identify behavior traits deeply rooted in personality and resistant to change. Without this knowledge Mitzel believes research will have little effect on improving teaching.

After examining representative studies on teaching effectiveness, Barr (6) detected a combination of factors that have frustrated the progress of research to date. These are described as the complexity of the teaching act, absence of objective criteria to measure "success," faulty or inadequate

measuring instruments, and paucity of good, critical, evaluative research.

Ryans (50, p. 371) position is that it is irrelevant to discuss teacher effectiveness except within the context of a particular system of values. The wide variation of the differences in teacher roles precludes establishing a set standard for judging effectiveness. In other words what the "disciplinarian" judges as effective teaching may not be the same as the expectations of the "motivator." Nonetheless, Ryans (51) proposes two general empirical approaches for judging effectiveness. The first is through observation of the teacher. The second is through observation of the teacher's effect upon the student. This naturally reduces the criteria of teacher effectiveness to (1) ratings of teacher success and (2) measurements of student change.

Mouly (41) proposes that teacher effectiveness is directly related to the teacher's ability to interact with students. Maximum effectiveness is possible only when the teacher has a clear concept of his teaching role plus thorough acquaintance with methods and subject matter. Classroom observation could evidence the degree of success the individual teacher is experiencing.

Combs (17, pp. 34-36) emphasizes another aspect of analyzing teaching efficiency. "The cause of human behavior," he states, "lies in the purposes, beliefs, convictions, and understandings of people, the ways in which they perceive

themselves and the world in which they function." Combs says the validity of classroom observation is brought into question if one acknowledges that different beliefs can produce the same behavior. His exhortation is "to embark upon a program of research designed to explore the 'self as instrument'." He further asserts that the absence of objective criteria for determining good teaching does not negate making judgements concerning quality. This responsibility, he feels, resides with the profession.

Others also subscribe to the view that the profession must and can make accurate judgements. Evans (20) reports that the most suitable opinions of effectiveness for general use are those of professionals. These people are defined as those in position of leadership with requisite experience and knowledge to provide a valid rating in a given situation. Conversely, Evans feels that adequate criteria to judge teacher effectiveness based on student change is yet to emerge. Rolfe (48) found that rating scales used by experienced and competent supervisors showed a significant correlation with teaching ability. Hampton (29) also concluded that it is possible to develop rating scales with relatively few items and still accurately deduce teacher effectiveness.

It is readily apparent that one of the major problems in gauging teacher effectiveness or success is the criteria used in the measurement. Procedures vary considerable and may range from detailed check lists to long essays. Hale (28)

reported that the most frequently used objective measures were of factors such as mental ability, interest, personality, and space relations. Ryans (51) and Fattu (21) concluded that teacher rating devices are the most frequently used measure for research and administrative purposes.

Fattu (21) gives a critical summation of ratings as a means to determine effectiveness. He states that ratings may consist of an over-all estimate of teacher effectiveness or of specific teacher behaviors and traits. These may take the form of self-ratings, peer ratings by other teachers, by students, or administrative personnel. Ratings of teacher effectiveness usually require judgements based on observation of classroom performance and subjective estimates of student performance.

Fattu points out that if effective teaching is viewed as bringing about desired changes, then the obvious approach is to measure student change. The shortcoming in this method, he observes, is the difficulty of precise measurement. Even if measurement were possible the question of how much of the change to attribute to the teacher would be a problem. Though elaborate statistical and experimental methods have been developed, he reports that no one has yet demonstrated effective use of a pupil-gain criterion in measuring teaching success.

The most widely used measure of teacher competence and the type used in this study is administrative opinion. Fattu concludes that studies indicate that teachers within a local

area can be rated reliably by administrative personnel, but that these ratings have not correlated highly with student-gains measures. The more intangible traits of personality produced the greatest disparity in ratings by administrators; and their ratings, though reliable, lacked validity in identifying superior teaching. The final criticism is that rating scales themselves are usually lacking in specific, valid categories applicable to the situation (21).

Andrews and Brown (5) investigated one of the suspected limitations inherent in principals' ratings of teacher effectiveness. This involved the extent that similar personality characteristics of the principal and teacher influenced the rating of success or efficiency. Guba and Bidwell (26) had found that the principal's rating reflected his perception of how well the teacher conformed to the principal's expectations for the teacher-role. They thus concluded that similarity in personality characteristics between principal and teacher would result in a correspondingly high rating. Stern, Stein and Bloom (56) gave support to this argument. They suggested that the teacher behavior rated by the principal is a function of transactional relationships between the teacher and his social and non-social environment. The degree to which the principal is a part of the social environment would affect the rating process. Andrews and Brown found no relationship, however, between teacher-principal similarity in personality elements and principals' ratings

of teachers' effectiveness. A similar study by Prince (43) also produced findings which gives support to ratings as a measure of effectiveness free from this type of spurious personality effect.

Brain (13) reviewed many approaches and failings in evaluating successful teachers. Although no approach is really adequate, he points out that practical decisions still have to be made. Teaching applicants have to be judged. Those already employed must be evaluated so that they may be assigned, transferred, promoted and, in some cases, discharged. School officials have to face the practical necessity of making evaluative judgements about the quality of their staff members. Since few conclusive results have emerged from research studies on teaching effectiveness, school officials are forced to make decisions based on assumptions rather than reliable evidence. These assumptions include psychological factors such as teacher attitudes, values and adjustment as significantly related to teacher effectiveness. Brain accurately points out that studies in this area have been conflicting. Despite the negligible result of past efforts, he urges that "research in the area of effectiveness must continue" (13, p. 36).

One inevitably concludes from delving into the literature on evaluating successful teaching that any technique used lacks supportive evidence as to its validity. The most reliable and widely used approach for measuring teacher

effectiveness is the administrative rating. Some criteria must be used for assessing or identifying successful teachers in order to determine what psychological or personality factors are associated with these teachers. The present study accepts the administrative rating technique, with its acknowledged shortcomings, as the best demonstrable method to date for this purpose.

The research design of the present study provides for comparing the values of principals and the teachers they rate, and from this comparison conclusions are drawn in regard to the congruence or incongruence of principal-teacher values. Many authorities (20, 48), 29, 21, 5, 43) offer evidence that administrative ratings can be used with some degree of confidence as criteria for evaluating teachers.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Allport, Gordon W., Pattern and Growth in Personality, New York, Holt, Rhinehart and Winston, Inc., 1961.

2. _____, Personality: A Psychological Interpretation, New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1937.

3. Allport, Gordon W., Philip E. Vernon and Gardner Lindzey, Manual: Study of Values, Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1960.

4. Anderson, H. M., "Study of Certain Criteria of Teaching Effectiveness," Journal of Experimental Education, XXIII (1954), 47-71.

5. Andrews, John H. and Alan F. Brown, "Can Principals Exclude Their Own Personality Characteristics When They Rate Their Teachers?" Educational Administration and Supervision, XLV (July, 1959), 234-242.

6. Barr, A. S., "The Measurement and Prediction of Teaching Efficiency: A Summary of Investigations," Journal of Experimental Education, XVI (June, 1958), 203-263.

7. Barr, A. S. and Robert E. Jones, "The Measurement and Prediction of Teacher Efficiency," Review of Educational Research, XXVIII (June, 1958), 256-264.

8. Biber, Barbara, "Problems of Values and Measures in Evaluation of Teaching," Educational Leadership, XV (1958), 213-217.

9. Biddle, Bruce J. and William J. Ellena, Contemporary Research on Teacher Effectiveness, Chicago, Holt, Rhinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964.

10. Billingsly, Leon Commodore, "Characteristics of Teacher Effectiveness," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Education, University of Arkansas, 1961.

11. Borg, Walter R., "Personality and Interest Measures as Related to Criteria of Instructor Effectiveness," Journal of Educational Research, L (1957), 701-709.

12. Bowie, Lucile B. and Gerthon Morgan, "Personal Values and Verbal Behavior of Teachers," The Journal of Experimental Education, XXX (June, 1962), 337-345.

13. Brain, George, "Evaluating Teacher Effectiveness," NEA Journal, LIV (February, 1965), 35-36.

14. Calabria, F. M., "Characteristics of Effective Teachers," Educational Research Bulletin, XXXIX (1960), 92-100.

15. Carlile, A. B., "Predicting Performance in the Teaching Profession," Journal of Educational Research, XLVII (May, 1954), 641-658.

16. Cole, David L., "The Prediction of Teaching Performance," Journal of Educational Research, LIV (May, 1961), 345-348.

17. Combs, Arthur W., "Can We Measure Good Teaching: Objective Measurement Is Impossible," NEA Journal, LIII (January, 1964), 35-36, 73.

18. Combs, Arthur W. and Donald Snygg, Individual Behavior, New York, Harper and Row, 1959.

19. Densford, John P., "Value Theory as Basic to a Philosophy of Education," History of Education Quarterly, III (June, 1963), 102-106.

20. Evans, K. M., "A Critical Survey of Methods of Assessing Teacher Ability," British Journal of Educational Psychology, XXI (June, 1951), 89-95.

21. Fattu, Nicholas A., "What Research Says About Teacher Effectiveness," National Educational Association, L (October, 1961), 55-56.

22. Ginsburg, Sol W., "Values of the Psychiatrist," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, XX (July, 1950), 466.

23. Ginsburg, Sol W. and John L. Herma, "Values and Their Relationship to Psychiatric Principles and Practice," American Journal of Psychotherapy, VII (July, 1953), 554.

24. Gowan, John C., "Intercorrelations and Factor Analyses of Tests Given to Teaching Candidates," Journal of Experimental Education, XXVII (September, 1958), 1-22.

25. Gowan, John C., "A Summary of the Intensive Study of Twenty Highly Selected Elementary Women Teachers," Journal of Experimental Education, XXVI (December, 1957), 115-124.

26. Guba, E. G. and C. E. Bidwell, Administrative Relationships: Teacher Effectiveness, Teacher Satisfaction and Administrative Behavior, Chicago, Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1957.

27. Guba, E. G. and J. W. Getzels, "Personality and Teacher Effectiveness: A Problem in Theoretical Research," Journal of Educational Psychology, XLVI (1955), 340-344.

28. Hale, Peter P., "Isolating Objective Factors for the Teaching Profession," Journal of Educational Research, XLVIII (March, 1955), 497-507.

29. Hampton, N. D., "An Analysis of Supervisory Ratings of Elementary Teachers Graduated from Iowa State Teachers College," Journal of Experimental Education, XX (December, 1951), 180-215.

30. Jacob, Philip E., Changing Values in College, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1957.

31. Jones, Margaret L., "An Analysis of Certain Aspects of Teaching Ability," Journal of Experimental Education, XXV (1956), 153-180.

32. Lawhead, Victor B., "Values Through Identification," Educational Leadership, XXI (May, 1964), 515-518.

33. Levin, H., T. L. Hilton and Gloria L. Leiderman, "Studies of Teacher Behavior," Journal of Experimental Education, XXVI (1957), 81-91.

34. Manwiller, L. V., "Expectations Regarding Teachers," Journal of Experimental Education, XXI (1958), 315-354.

35. Maslow, Abraham, "Deficiency Motivation and Growth Motivation," Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, edited by Marshall R. Jones, Lincoln, Nebraska, University of Nebraska Press, 1955.

36. _____, Motivation and Personality, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1954.

37. Maslow, Abraham, "Psychological Data and Value Theory," New Knowledge in Human Values, edited by Abraham Maslow, New York, Harper and Brothers (1959), pp. 119-136.

38. Medley, Donald M. and Harold E. Mitzel, "A Tentative Framework for the Study of Effective Teacher Behavior," Journal of Experimental Education, XXX (June, 1962), 317-320.

39. Mitzel, Harold E., "Teacher Effectiveness," Encyclopedia of Educational Research, (Third Edition), New York, MacMillan and Co., 1960, pp. 1481-1485.

40. _____, "Can We Measure Good Teaching Objectively: Recent Research Holds Promise That We Can," NEA Journal, LIII (January, 1964), 35-36.

41. Mouly, George J., Psychology for Effective Teaching, Dallas, Holt, Rhinehart and Winston, Inc., 1958.

42. Paschal, Billy J., "How Children Learn Values," Educational Digest, XXXIII (May, 1958), 49-51.

43. Prince, R., "Individual Values and Administrative Effectiveness," Administrator's Notebook, VI (December, 1957), 1-4.

44. Rabinowitz, W. and R. M. W. Travers, "Problems of Defining and Assessing Teacher Effectiveness," Educational Theory, III (1953), 212-219.

45. Raths, James, "Values and Valuing," Educational Leadership, XXI (May, 1964), 543-546.

46. Raths, Louis E., "Sociological Knowledge and Needed Curriculum Research," Research Frontiers in the Study of Children's Learning, edited by James B. Macdonald, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, School of Education, University of Wisconsin, 1960, p. 24.

47. Riccio, Anthony C. and Herman J. Peters, "The Study of Values and the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory," Educational Research Bulletin, XXXIX (April, 1960), 101-103.

48. Rolfe, J. F., "The Measurement of Teaching Ability," Journal of Experimental Education, XIV (September, 1945), 52-74.

49. Rupiper, Omer John, "A Psychometric Evaluation of Experienced Teachers," The Journal of Educational Research, LV (May, 1962), 369-371.

50. Ryans, David G., Characteristics of Teachers, Washington, D. C., American Council on Education, 1960.

51. _____, "The Criteria of Teaching Effectiveness," Journal of Educational Research, XLII (May, 1949), 690-699.

52. _____, "The Investigation of Teacher Characteristics," Education Record, XXXIV (1953), 371-396.

53. Scott, William A., Values and Organizations, Chicago, Rand McNally and Company, 1965.

54. Seagoe, May V., "Prediction of In-Service Success in Teaching," Journal of Educational Research, XXXIX (May, 1946), 658-663.

55. Spranger, Eduard, Types of Men, translated by P. J. V. Pigors, Halle, Max Niemeyer, 1928.

56. Stern, G. S., M. I. Stein and B. S. Bloom, Methods in Personality Assessment, Glencoe, Illinois, The Free Press, 1956.

57. Tanner, William C., Jr., "Personality Bases in Teacher Selection," Phi Delta Kappan, XXXV (April, 1954) 271-277.

58. "Teacher Effectiveness Research: Problems and Status," California Journal of Educational Research, IX (1958), 148-158, 166.

59. "Tests and Reviews: Study of Values: A Scale for Measuring the Dominant Interests in Personality, Third Edition," The Sixth Mental Measurements Yearbook, Oscar K. Boros, editor, Highland Park, New Jersey, The Gryphon Press, 1965.

60. Witty, Paul A., "Some Characteristics of the Effective Teacher," Educational Administration and Supervision, XXXVI (April, 1950), 193-208.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

This chapter is organized under the various headings which made up the major elements or components of the methods and procedures used in gathering the data for the study. These headings are (1) Selection of Subjects, (2) Selection of Schools, (3) Selection of Districts, (4) Instruments Used, (5) Coding of Instruments, (6) Instructions Pertinent to Completion of Instruments, (7) Administration of Instruments and (8) Processing Data.

Selection of Subjects

The subjects used in the study were 284 secondary classroom teachers, fifteen secondary principals, and fifteen secondary assistant principals. The teachers were randomly selected from the staffs of fifteen schools. The selection of principals corresponded with the selection of schools. Assistant principal selection also corresponded with the selection of schools except in cases where more than one assistant principal was assigned to a school. In this instance the assistant was chosen whose administrative function provided the best opportunity to know and evaluate the classroom teachers in the school.

The process of randomly selecting twenty teachers from each of the staffs of the fifteen schools was simple. An alphabetized roster of the teaching staff of a particular school was obtained from the principal. Members of the professional staff who could not be evaluated in a classroom teaching situation were marked off this list. The people marked off the list included those who functioned as full-time study hall teachers, librarians, counselors, and persons involved solely in extracurricular activities such as coaching athletic teams, drill teams, etc. Shop teachers, choir teachers, and band directors functioned sufficiently in a classroom setting to be included in the randomized selection process. The names of those classroom teachers remaining on the list were then numbered consecutively. The researcher then consulted a table of random numbers (1) to determine which names by number were to be used in the study. These names were then transcribed onto a coded slip of paper. This code corresponded to a code on one Study of Values test instrument and two rating forms. The principal and assistant principal used the coded slip for identification purposes so that the anonymity of the rated teacher was assured. The coded slip also was used in assigning the correspondingly coded Values instrument to the right teacher at the test administration. The coding method proved to be an effective means of obtaining anonymous ratings and responses of teachers participating in the study.

Selection of Schools

A correspondingly simple procedure was adhered to in providing for an unbiased selection of schools. A simple coin toss resolved the choice of selection in a district which had two or more junior (grades 7-9) or senior (grades 10-12) high schools. If no choice existed in a district at the junior high or senior high level the school was automatically selected. Selection by coin toss was made in the central administrative offices after the superintendents had agreed to the study.

Table I indicates the secondary school composition of the five districts and the type and number of schools chosen from each district. More junior high schools than senior

TABLE I

THE SECONDARY SCHOOL COMPOSITION OF THE FIVE DISTRICTS AND THE TYPE AND NUMBER OF SCHOOLS CHOSEN FROM EACH DISTRICT

District	Senior High Schools		Junior High Schools	
	Available	Used	Available	Used
A	4	2	5	3
B	2	1	5	3
C	1	1	3	2
D	1	0	3	1
E	1	1	1	1
Total	9	5	17	10

high schools were available for use in the study. This resulted in ten junior high schools and five senior high schools being selected.

Two senior high schools were selected from District A because the senior high school in District D did not qualify for use in the study. In essence this was because the assistant principal did not feel that he could adequately observe the classroom performance of his teachers prior to completing the teacher evaluation form.

Selection of Districts

The five school districts used in the study were all located in the North Central Texas area. The districts were selected because they were amenable to this type research project and met certain other prescribed criteria of the research design. These criteria were that the district have a scholastic population falling within the range of 3,000 to 30,000 and have at least one senior high school classified 3A in size or above by the Texas Interscholastic League. Five out of the first six school districts contacted were amenable to the project.

Instruments Used

Two instruments were used to collect the desired data. The Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values provided the information on the personal values or interests of the teachers, assistant principals, and principals participating in the

project. This test booklet is standardized and commercially produced and was purchased for use in the research. An additional sheet was stapled to the front of each booklet requesting the teacher to write in his or her years of teaching experience and highest college degree attained. The other instrument used was an adapted teacher evaluation form developed at Northwestern University. For purposes of clarity it is referred to throughout the study as the Northwestern Teacher Evaluation Form. Permission for Northwestern University allowed for the mimeographed reproduction of this instrument. The principal and assistant principal completed this evaluation form on each teacher under his supervision who participated in the study.

Coding of Instruments

A code was devised for use with the instruments so that the anonymity of the participants would be assured. A principal and assistant principal at a particular school were designated by the same letter of the alphabet. The distinction between the two was made by using subscript numbers 1 and 2. This combination of the letter and subscript, i.e., A_1, A_2; B_1, B_2, was used on the evaluation forms. It was immaterial which coded set of twenty evaluation forms the assistant principal and principal completed. Only distinction between the two separate ratings was necessary to compute an average evaluation of the individual teacher. The principal

and assistant principal also completed a Study of Values test coded identically to their set of teacher evaluation forms. The teachers were assigned an identifying code number peculiar to one Study of Values test and two evaluation forms. The evaluation forms consisted of a total code designating the principal or assistant principal and the teacher, i.e., A_1 - 16, A_2 - 16; B_1 - 4, B_2 - 4. The teacher completed that Values test with his or her code number on it. The principal and assistant principal completed the evaluation form within his set which had the identical number for that particular teacher.

Instructions Pertinent to Completion of Instruments

The principal and assistant principal of each participating school were informed of the general purposes of the study. It was explained that certain requirements or restrictions would apply. These had to be acknowledged and observed by both in order for the research to result in valid conclusions. The first was that the teacher evaluations be made independently. The second was that a teacher would be observed at least twice in a teaching situation prior to completion of the rating instrument. And thirdly, teachers scores on the Values instruments would not be available to them. It was requested that the twenty selected teachers be informed that their participation in the project was strictly voluntary. A brief explanation was also given on the use of the Northwestern Teacher Evaluation Form.

Before completing the Study of Values the teachers were told of the general purposes of the research. In essence the study was explained as an attempt to determine the values or interests of experienced teachers and the relationship that these might have to success in teaching. They were assured that the coding of the instruments and the procedures for processing the information provided for their anonymity.

Administration of Instruments

Procedures for administration of the test instruments had to be modified at times to meet unexpected contingencies. With one or two noted exceptions, however, the following predetermined procedures generally were practicable.

The principal and assistant principal completed the Study of Values before receiving the teacher evaluation forms. A future date was then set to administer the Values instrument to the twenty selected teachers. Sufficient time was allowed in the interval so that the two administrators could complete the evaluations. The average time lapse for the fifteen schools was approximately six weeks. The shortest during between administering the Values test to the principals and the teachers was three weeks; the longest was approximately nine weeks.

No real problems were encountered in arranging briefings for the principals and assistant principals and administering the Study of Values to them. Scheduling dates for administering the instrument to the teacher groups proved to be more

difficult. Numerous factors frustrated or disrupted the testing schedule. The first difficulty was in finding a convenient time to get a faculty group of twenty teachers together. Many had duties before or after school precluding attendance at a test session. These conflicting assignments consisted of such activities as hall duty, bus driving, club sponsorships, and detention hall or study hall duties. It became apparent that for some schools the scheduling conflict could not be overcome. Rather than reselect people who could be available at a particular time and date, two or three subgroupings of the originally selected teachers were scheduled for testing. Sometimes this was possible within one school day. The longest time necessary to test one faculty group was over a three day period. The participants in these subgroups were asked not to discuss the test with other teachers until all other participants had completed the measure. Seven of the fifteen faculty groups were administered the Study of Values in this fashion. The remaining eight groups were all administered the instrument immediately before or after regular school hours.

Of the original 300 teachers randomly selected to participate in the study responses from only 284 were finally used. Various reasons account for this disparity. Several of the test instruments were incorrectly completed and had to be discarded. Resignations during the interim between selection and test administration accounted for two losses.

An unusually high incidence of illness was prevalent during the testing period accounting for several others. A few of those selected simply did not wish to participate in the study. The largest number of losses of teachers at any one school was four.

Processing Data

The Study of Values tests were handscored by the researcher. The six value scores were transcribed onto worksheets in a form facilitating transferral to IBM data cards for use in the computerized statistical analysis. The two Northwestern Teacher Evaluation Forms on each teacher were averaged item by item and the average item score and the three category totals were transcribed in a similar fashion. IBM data cards were then punched with the corresponding information for computerized statistical analysis.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Walker, Helen M., Joseph Lev, Elementary Statistical Methods, New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1958.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The organization of this chapter revolves around the purposes of the study, the research hypotheses, and the tabular presentation of the data. The statistical procedures used consisted of correlations, analysis of variances, and simple mean comparisons. The first six hypotheses were tested by correlational analysis and related to the first purpose of the study. The remaining hypotheses were tested by analysis of variances and simple mean comparisons. The hypotheses for the second and third purposes are interrelated and discussed together. The other hypotheses are discussed separately under the purposes of the study to which they are related. Data tables are found adjacent to the discussion of the hypotheses to which they pertain. The exception to this are the complete tables showing all the coefficients of correlation related to hypotheses 1-6. These tables are found in the Appendix.

The chapter discussion is organized under the following sub-topics: (1) First Purpose: Hypotheses 1-6: Summary, (2) Second and Third Purposes: Hypotheses 7 and 8: Summary, (3) Fourth Purpose: Hypothesis 9, (4) Fifth Purpose: Hypothesis 10, (5) Sixth Purpose: Hypothesis 11, and (6) Seventh Purpose: Hypothesis 12.

First Purpose: Hypotheses 1-6

The first purpose of the study was to determine if a significant relationship existed between selected secondary teachers' values and principals' evaluations of their success. The six value scores of each teacher were correlated with their corresponding success scores on each item and the three categories comprising the rating instrument. Table II shows the correlations for the six values and three categories.

TABLE II

PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATIONS AMONG SUCCESS CRITERIA AND TEACHERS' VALUES

Success Criteria	Theoretical	Economic	Aesthetic	Social	Political	Religious
Professional Competencies	-.09	-.02	.14*	-.02	-.09	.04
Relationships With Others	-.12*	.01	.09	-.03	-.09	.10
Personal Traits and Qualities	-.08	-.01	.15*	-.01	-.10	.01

*Significant at the .05 level. N = 284

The correlational findings relative to the six values around which the first six hypotheses were formulated are as follows:

Hypothesis 1

The first hypothesis was that there would be no significant relationship between selected secondary teachers' Theoretical value scores and the success criteria. Only one success category, Relationships With Others, was significantly different from zero and it was in a negative direction, $r = -.12$. This means that those teachers who obtained a high Theoretical score received a correspondingly low rating in this category. The correlational coefficient was so small as to make a practical interpretation of this statistical observation impossible. The Relationships category consisted of just two items. Both revealed negative correlations but only the "Relationship With the Supervising Teacher" item was significantly different from zero, $r = -.12$. Correlations at this level can be viewed as indicating only a very slight relationship between the two variables.

The Professional Competencies category was not significantly different from zero. Two of the rated items ("Understanding the Individual," $r = -.13$ and "Professional Ethics," $r = -.13$), however, revealed significant negative correlations. It seems worthy to note that eleven of the twelve rated items showed negative correlations with the Theoretical value. A significant relationship between the Theoretical value and the Professional Competencies category did not prove to be existent, with the exception of the two aforementioned items.

The hypothesis as applied to this category was generally supported on the basis of the findings.

All of the ten items comprising the Personal Traits and Qualities category revealed non-significant, negative correlations with the Theoretical value. The category itself produced a nonsignificant correlation, $r = -.08$.

The expected lack of a significant relationship between teachers' Theoretical values and the success criteria was substantiated overall by the statistical findings. Yet only a qualified acceptance of the hypothesis is in order because of the significant negative correlation with one of the success catefories. With this exception taken into account the findings are in agreement with previous findings of similar studies.

Hypothesis 2

The second hypothesis was that there would be a significant negative relationship between the teachers' Economic value and the success criteria. The statistical findings did not reveal significant correlations for the three categories and all but one of the individual rated items. In the Professional Competencies category the "word usage" rating produced a negative correlation, $r = -.13$, significant from zero. Sixteen of the total twenty-four items did produce correlations in a negative direction. Based on the findings however, this hypothesis was rejected.

The findings for the Economic value are contradictory to previous research. Other studies (4, 5, 6) indicated that a significant relationship might be expected between teachers success ratings and the economic value. Most of the rated items of the present study produced correlations in a negative direction. Based on the findings, however, this hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis 3

The third hypothesis was that there would be a significant positive relationship between teachers' Aesthetic value and the success criteria. The findings generally supported this hypothesis. Seven of the twelve items comprising the Professional Competencies category had significant positive correlations. Consequently, the category correlated positively with the Aesthetic value, $r = .14$. One item, "word usage," produced a correlation that was statistically significant at the .01 level, $r = .35$. There appears to be a positive relationship between a teachers' vocabulary and classroom communication and the Aesthetic value. This is supported by the next highest correlated item in the category, "Ability to Communicate in the Classroom," $r = .21$. In the Relationships category the item "Relationship With the Supervising Teacher," produced a positive correlation, $r = .12$. The correlation for the category, nonetheless was not significant. One half of the ten items comprising the Personal Traits and

Qualities category had correlations significantly different from zero at the .05 level. This category was positively significant, r = .15.

Based upon the findings, the research hypothesis that a significant positive relationship existed between the success criteria and the Aesthetic value was generally supported. All of the correlations were in a positive direction although one category, Relationships With Others, and eleven of the twenty-four items were not significant. The findings of the present study are consistent with previous studies (2, 4, 8, 9) denoting the existence of a positive relationship between the Aesthetic value and teaching success. Such small coefficients of correlation, however, are valueless for predictive purposes.

Hypothesis 4

The fourth hypothesis was that there would be a significant positive relationship between teachers' Social value and the success criteria. There was not a single correlation which proved to be significant. On the basis of the findings this hypothesis was rejected. It is interesting to note that seventeen of the twenty-seven correlations although not significant, were in a negative direction.

The findings in regard to this value appear to be contradictory with two previous studies (4, 10). Both studies sampled future or student teacher populations and scores on teacher prognosis instruments were used as criteria denoting

teacher success. The disparity in research findings might be explained in terms of the use of different techniques and populations.

Hypothesis 5

The fifth hypothesis was that there would be no significant relationship between teachers' Political value and the success criteria. This hypothesis was substantially supported by the research findings. None of the correlations of the three categories proved significant. Most of the correlations were in a negative direction and five of the rated items were significant from zero at the .05 level.

One previous study (8) employed education students in its sample and correlated their scores on the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory with the Study of Values. A low positive correlation with the Political value was revealed. Several other studies using the Study of Values with various populations and rating techniques found no significant relationship with the Political value and measures of teacher success.

Hypothesis 6

The sixth hypothesis was that there would be no significant relationship between teachers' Religious value and the success criteria. This hypothesis was fully supported by the research findings. Not one item was significant from zero at or near the .05 level.

The findings in regard to this value are in harmony with all previous research concerned with correlating the Study of Values with teacher success. Nonetheless, it is interesting to note that this is the distinguishing value orientation of the teachers in the present research.

Summary: Hypothesis 1-6.--In summary, four of the six research hypotheses were supported. Three of the hypotheses were premised on no relationship of the values and the success criteria. Thus this study did not reveal any substantial relationships between the six values and the success criteria. Several of the items and three categories did evidence correlations significantly different from zero. It is necessary to point out that even these correlations fell within the range that indicates no more than 4 per cent of the variance in the two measures is common to both (3, pp. 277-287). Correlations at this level have little practical value. With possibly the exception of the Aesthetic value, there were not enough significant correlations at this level to suggest further research with more precise instruments.

Second and Third Purposes: Hypotheses 7-8

The second and third purposes of the study were to determine if a significant difference existed in the values of principals and teachers. The specific intent was to ascertain if principals have similar values to those teachers who receive high ratings on the success criteria. The statistical procedure was to compare the mean values of the principals to

three groups of teachers rated in the top third according to the three success categories and three groups of teachers rated in lower third according to the three success categories. However, some preliminary statistical analysis was necessary to determine (1) if the values of principals differed significantly from the values of teachers as a whole and (2) if the lower and upper third of the teachers when grouped according to the three success categories differed significantly in their values. In the second instance if no significant differences existed in the upper and lower groups it would be redundant to make further comparisons with the principals. Any significant differences observed in the values of the total teacher group and the principals would be applicable to the two non-differing groups.

Consequently the first preliminary statistical analysis determined if teacher values as a whole were significantly different from the principals. This resulted in two values being revealed as significantly different. In Table III it can be readily observed that teachers as a whole have a significantly lower Economic value than principals. Conversely, principals have a significantly lower Aesthetic value than the teachers. These differences could be attributed to population differences. The principals were all male and a large majority of the teachers were female. The norms (2, p. 12) for the Study of Values established on a mixed group give an Economic mean of 40.33 and an Aesthetic

mean of 38.88. These are very close to the means of the teachers reported in Table III. Norms established for men on the Economic and Aesthetic values indicate means of 42.78 and 35.09, respectively. The norms for women give an Economic mean value of 37.87 and 42.67 for the Aesthetic value. This study was not concerned with differences due to sex, but this factor cannot be ignored in interpreting this statistical observation.

TABLE III

COMPARISONS OF VALUES OF TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS

Variable	Teachers		Principals		t	Level
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Theoretical	39.19	6.91	40.03	4.67	-.65	NS
Economic	40.03	7.51	43.50	5.90	-2.44	.05
Aesthetic	39.17	9.18	32.23	7.28	3.99	.01
Social	37.09	7.59	37.70	7.81	-.41	NS
Political	39.65	6.83	41.30	6.87	-1.25	NS
Religious	44.93	8.38	45.169	8.12	-.14	NS
	N = 284		N = 30			

The next preliminary statistical analysis involved sorting the teachers into upper third and lower third according to their scores on the three success categories--Professional Competencies, Relationships With Others, and Personal Traits and Qualities. A Fisher's *t* test was applied to determine if

significant differences existed in the mean value scores of the two groups. If no significant differences existed in the six mean values of the upper and lower groups, it was obvious that any comparisons made concerning the upper and lower groups with the principals would reveal similar differences previously observed for teachers as a whole. Consequently no further statistical comparisons were made with the principals if the upper and lower third groups indicated no significant differences in their six mean value scores.

Hypotheses 7-8

The hypotheses to test the second and third purposes of the study are inter-related. Discussions of research findings relevant to one necessarily involves the other. The seventh hypothesis was premised on finding a significant value relationship between principals and teachers rated in the upper third on the three success categories. The eighth hypothesis was premised on finding no significant value relationship between the principals and lower third teachers on the same variables. The discussion of the findings applicable to these hypotheses revolves around the three success category groupings. As previously stated, comparisons were first made of the two teacher groups. Where significant differences existed in the two teacher groups the values of these two groups were then compared with the principals' values. For purposes of discussion the research findings applicable to these hypotheses

subdivide according to the three success variables and (1) Professional Competencies (2) Relationships With Others (3) Personal Traits and Qualities (4) Summary: Hypotheses 7-8.

Perusal of Table IV reveals that no significant differences existed at or beyond the .05 level when comparisons were made of the two groups six mean value scores. Therefore no further comparison with the six mean value scores of principals was necessary.

TABLE IV

COMPARISON OF VALUES OF TEACHERS RATED IN THE UPPER THIRD AND LOWER THIRD ACCORDING TO THE PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCIES CATEGORY

Variable	Teachers		Principals		t	Level
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Theoretical	38.13	5.71	39.66	7.84	-1.58	NS
Economic	39.31	7.53	39.37	7.50	-.06	NS
Aesthetic	40.80	8.74	39.98	9.69	1.38	NS
Social	37.77	7.47	37.16	7.64	.55	NS
Political	38.83	6.35	40.32	7.02	-1.52	NS
Religious	45.32	8.30	44.45	8.27	.72	NS
	N = 95		N = 95			

It can be ascertained from Table V that a significant difference exists in the two groups for the Theoretical value. Teachers with a high Theoretical value tended to be rated lower by their principals in this success category. This

TABLE V

COMPARISON OF VALUES OF TEACHERS RATED IN THE UPPER THIRD AND LOWER THIRD ACCORDING TO THE RELATIONSHIPS WITH OTHERS CATEGORY

Variable	Upper Third		Lower Third		t	Level
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Theoretical	38.40	6.43	40.32	6.95	-2.04	.05
Economic	40.31	7.06	40.20	7.76	.11	NS
Aesthetic	39.31	9.03	37.61	9.15	1.32	NS
Social	36.82	7.90	37.25	7.29	-.39	NS
Political	38.91	6.37	40.58	7.01	-1.70	NS
Religious	46.22	8.26	43.98	8.34	1.85	NS
	N = 95		N = 95			

observation is consistent with the findings under hypothesis one which revealed a significant negative correlation between the Theoretical value and the Relationships With Others category. Because of this significant difference in the Theoretical value of the upper and lower groups, further value comparisons were made with the principals.

The significant differences which exist between this group of teachers and the principals are the same differences which exist for teachers as a whole. By referring to Table VI one can see that teachers rated in the upper third on this variable have a significantly higher Aesthetic value and a significantly lower Economic value. No significant

difference is apparent in the Theoretical value of the principals and the upper third group of teachers.

TABLE VI

COMPARISON OF VALUES OF TEACHERS RATED IN THE UPPER THIRD ACCORDING TO THE RELATIONSHIPS WITH OTHERS CATEGORY AND PRINCIPALS

Variable	Upper Third		Principals		t	Level
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Theoretical	38.40	6.43	30.03	4.67	-1.20	NS
Economic	40.31	7.06	43.50	5.90	-2.09	.05
Aesthetic	39.31	9.03	32.23	7.28	3.79	.05
Social	36.82	7.90	37.70	7.81	-.55	NS
Political	38.91	6.37	41.30	6.87	-1.68	NS
Religious	46.22	8.26	45.16	8.12	.60	NS
	N = 95		N = 30			

The research findings shown in Table VII indicate that significant differences that exist for the lower third group on this variable and the principals are the same as those for the upper third group of teachers. The Theoretical value was not significantly different for the principals when compared to either of the two teacher groups.

TABLE VII

COMPARISON OF VALUES OF TEACHERS RATED IN THE LOWER THIRD ACCORDING TO THE RELATIONSHIPS WITH OTHERS CATEGORY AND PRINCIPALS

Variable	Lower Third		Principals		t	Level
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Theoretical	40.32	6.95	40.03	4.67	.22	NS
Economic	40.20	7.76	43.50	5.90	-2.16	.05
Aesthetic	37.61	9.15	32.23	7.28	2.87	.05
Social	37.25	7.29	37.70	7.81	-.28	NS
Political	40.58	7.01	41.30	6.87	-.50	NS
Religious	43.98	8.34	45.16	8.12	-.67	NS
	N = 95		N = 30			

Summary: Hypotheses 7-8.--The seventh hypothesis of the study was rejected on the basis of the findings. Teachers rated in the upper third on the three success variables have a significantly different value orientation than principals. The eighth hypothesis of the study was supported by the findings and was accepted. Teachers rated in the lower third of the three success variables have a significantly different value orientation than the principals. The conclusions regarding these two hypotheses lead logically to other determinations about the values of principals and teachers. The first is that teachers as a whole group differ significantly in their value orientation with principals. The

second is that teachers receiving high and low ratings by principals are not distinguished one from the other by their value orientation. The two value areas which distinguish teachers as a whole from principals were Aesthetic and Economic. The only value area which was significantly different for teachers rated in the upper and lower group on the Relationships variable was the Theoretical value. This was consistent with the negative correlational coefficient revealed previously between this value and success variable. Overall the upper third and lower third teachers grouped according to the three success variables did not differ in their values.

TABLE VIII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF VALUES OF TEACHERS WITH BACHELOR'S DEGREES AND MASTER'S DEGREES

Variable	Bachelor's		Master's	
	Mean	Variance	Mean	Variance
Theoretical	38.47	43.78	41.03	53.50
Economic	39.69	57.13	40.93	53.52
Aesthetic	39.63	84.94	37.96	80.74
Social	37.29	59.77	36.56	51.78
Political	40.00	45.92	38.75	47.60
Religious	44.97	68.62	44.84	74.58
	N = 205		N = 79	

F = 1.44* DFL= .6 DF2 = 277

*Not significant at .05 level.

Fourth Purpose: Hypothesis 9

The fourth purpose of the study was to determine if significant differences existed in the values of teachers with bachelor's degrees and the values of teachers with master's degrees. An analysis of variance technique, Hotelling T^2, was applied to determine if a significant variance was evident in the six mean value scores of the two groups. The resulting variance indicated that no significant differences existed in the mean values of the two groups at or beyond the .05 level. Therefore, the hypothesis that there would be significant differences was rejected.

Fifth Purpose: Hypothesis 10

The fifth purpose of the study was to determine if significant differences existed in the success ratings of teachers

TABLE IX

COMPARISON OF SUCCESS SCORES OF TEACHERS WITH BACHELOR'S DEGREES AND MASTER'S DEGREES

Variable	Bachelor's		Master's		t	Level
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Professional Competencies	45.36	6.32	46.18	7.05	-.9	NS
Relationships With Others	8.1	1.2	8.3	1.1	-1.36	NS
Personal Traits and Qualities	38.97	5.3	39.13	5.51	-.22	NS
	N = 205		N = 79			

with a bachelor's degree and master's degree. A statistical comparison was made on each of the means of the three success scores, (Professional Competencies, Relationships With Others, Personal Traits and Qualities) of the two groups. No significant differences of the two groups on the three variables was evident at the .05 level. The hypothesis that there would be significant differences was rejected.

Sixth Purpose: Hypothesis 11

The sixth purpose of the study was to determine if significant differences existed in the six values of teachers when grouped according to years of experience. The statistical procedure used was an analysis of variance of the six

TABLE X
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF VALUES OF TEACHERS GROUPED ACCORDING TO YEARS OF EXPERIENCE

Variable	Lower Third		Top Third	
	Mean	Variance	Mean	Variance
Theoretical	39.54	56.83	39.24	41.21
Economic	39.16	60.51	41.11	54.12
Aesthetic	40.29	96.33	38.24	65.08
Social	37.23	64.00	37.56	50.91
Political	39.81	48.63	38.93	46.77
Religious	44.09	72.38	45.09	74.57
	N = 95		N = 95	

TSQR = 6.71 *F = 1.09 DF1 = 6 DF2 = 183

*Not significant at .05 level.

mean value scores of teachers in the top third in years of experience and those in the lower third in years of experience. No significant variance at or beyond the .05 level was evident in the value profiles of the two groups. Thus the hypothesis that significant differences would exist in the values of teachers when grouped according to years of experience was rejected.

Seventh Purpose: Hypothesis 12

The seventh purpose of the study was to determine if significant differences existed in the ratings of teachers grouped according to years of experience. Statistical comparisons were made of the three mean success scores (Professional Competencies, Relationships With Others, Personal Traits and Qualities) of those teachers in the top third in

TABLE XI

COMPARISON OF SUCCESS SCORES OF TEACHERS GROUPED ACCORDING TO YEARS OF EXPERIENCE

Variable	Lower Third		Top Third		t	Level
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Professional Competencies	43.24	6.15	46.30	7.06	-3.16	.005
Relationships With Others	7.95	1.20	8.18	1.35	-1.24	NS
Personal Traits and Qualities	37.90	5.25	39.00	5.77	-1.36	NS
	N = 95		N = 95			

years of experience and those teachers in the lower third in years of experience. Two success scores, Relationships With Others and Personal Traits and Qualities, were not significant at or near the .05 level. The other success score, Professional Competencies, revealed a significant difference beyond the .005 level in favor of teachers in the top third in years of experience. Thus the hypothesis that significant differences existed in the mean success scores of teachers grouped according to years of experience was partially supported.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Allport, Gordon W., Philip E. Vernon and Gardner Lindzey, Manual: Study of Values, Boston, Houghton Mifflin

2. Billingsley, Leon Commodore, "Characteristics of Teacher Effectiveness," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Education, University of Arkansas, 1961.

3. Borg, Walter R., Educational Research: An Introduction, New York, David McKay Company, Inc., 1963.

4. Gowan, John C., "Intercorrelations and Factors Analyses of Tests Given to Teaching Candidates," Journal of Experimental Education, XXVIII (September, 1958), 1-22.

5. _____, "A Summary of the Intensive Study of Twenty Highly Selected Elementary Women Teachers," Journal of Experimental Education, XXVI (December, 1957), 115-124.

6. Guba, E. G. and J. W. Getzels, "Personality and Teacher Effectiveness: A Problem in Theoretical Research," Journal of Educational Psychology, XLVI (1955), 330-344.

7. Lindquist, E. F., Statistical Analysis in Educational Research, Dallas, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1940.

8. Riccio, Anthony C. and Herman J. Peters, "The Study of Values and the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory," Educational Research Bulletin, XXXIX (April, 1960), 101-103.

9. Seagoe, May V., "Prediction of In-Service Success in Teaching," Journal of Educational Research, XXXIX (May, 1946).

10. Tanner, William C., Jr., "Personality Bases in Teacher Selection," Phi Delta Kappan, XXXV (April, 1954), 271-277.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUMMARY

Conclusions, implications, and recommendations discussed in this chapter are those which arise from findings related to the originally stated purposes. The discussion of the conclusions and implications was organized around the specific purpose of the study to which it related. The recommendations are enumerated separately, and a summary of general observations is included. The chapter is organized under these sub-topics: (1) Conclusions and Implications, (2) Recommendations, and (3) Summary.

Conclusions and Implications

1. The first purpose of the study was to determine if a significant relationship existed between selected secondary teachers' values and principals' evaluations of their success. Six hypotheses related to each of the value categories of the Study of Values instrument were formulated for this purpose. Correlational analysis of the teachers' value scores and success ratings support the following conclusions:

a. The values measured by the Study of Values generally have no significant relationship to ratings of teacher success. There were significant relationships between the Theoretical and Aesthetic values and specific aspects of the

success criteria. These relationships were at such a low level of significance, however, that no practical application could be made of them.

b. The use of the Study of Values as an instrument to identify characteristic value orientations or interests of successful teachers using administrative ratings as the criteria is generally not supported by the findings of this study. There were two observations which are notable exceptions to this general conclusion.

(1) Secondary classroom teachers with high Aesthetic value scores are generally viewed by their supervisors as possessing a high degree of professional competence and personal traits and qualities desirable for good teachers.

(2) Secondary classroom teachers with high Aesthetic value scores are distinguished by their verbal competence and effective communication in the classroom.

c. An implication based upon conclusions b(1) and b(2) is that development or encouragement of Aesthetic values or interests in teachers might improve the quality of their classroom performance.

2. The second and third purposes of the study were to determine if significant differences existed in values of principals and assistant principals and the secondary classroom

teachers under their supervision. Specific intent of the purposes were to determine if principals' and assistant principals' values were significantly different from teachers who received high and low success ratings. The following conclusions were drawn in regard to these interrelated purposes:

a. Secondary principals and assistant principals have a significantly different value or interest orientation than secondary classroom teachers.

b. Secondary classroom teachers are essentially alike in their values or interests.

c. Secondary classroom teachers' values or interests do not influence or relate to the success ratings assigned them by their principals and assistant principals.

d. Based on the foregoing conclusions an implication is that occupational pursuits, specifically administrative or teaching, promote or greatly influence the dominant interests or values of a person as determined by the Study of Values test.

3. The fourth purpose of the study was to determine if significant differences existed in the values of teachers with bachelor's and master's degrees. The following conclusion applies: There are no significant differences in the values of teachers with master's and bachelor's degrees.

4. The fifth purpose of the study was to determine if significant differences existed in the success ratings of teachers with a bachelor's degree and master's degree. The

following conclusion applies: Advanced college preparation beyond the bachelor's degree does not improve a teacher's professional competencies to the extent that it influences the success rating given by administrative supervisors.

5. The sixth purpose of the study was to determine if significant differences existed in the six values of teachers grouped according to years of experience: There are no significant differences in the values of teachers with differing years of teaching experience.

The implication drawn from this is that the value reservoir that the Study of Values test samples are those which are concomitant to the profession rather than the individual.

6. The seventh purpose of the study was to determine if significant differences existed in the ratings of teachers grouped according to years of experience. The following conclusions are drawn based upon the research findings:

a. Years of classroom teaching experience is the significant factor related to increasing secondary teachers' professional competence as indicated by the administrative rating.

b. Secondary teachers' relationships with administrative supervisors and secondary teachers' personal traits and qualities are not significantly related to the administrative supervisor's evaluation of their success as a teacher.

Recommendations

1. A longitudinal study over several years is needed to determine to what extent persons entering the teaching profession change or modify their values or interests.

2. A longitudinal study is needed to ascertain if values of student teachers change to conform to the profession or if a predetermined value orientation leads them to choose this occupation in the first place.

3. Research is needed to shed light on what influences the development of values or interests predisposing one to enter the teaching profession.

4. A study is needed to investigate the nature of those factors or influences which cause principals and assistant principals to differ in their value or interest orientation from classroom teachers.

5. There is a need to investigate to what extent increasing teacher's aesthetic interests increases verbal and communication skills in the classroom.

6. Future studies should be concerned with the environmental and educational influences which promote the acquisition and development of desirable traits or characteristics associated with successful teachers. New techniques and instruments will need to be developed to detect and assess these value characteristics.

7. Further investigations might be concerned with determining the practical significance of the observed

Yheoretical value difference in high and low rated teachers grouped according to the Relationships With Others success criteria. The observed correlation in the present study was low and the success category consisted of only two items. Conclusions based upon the findings in this regard would be speculative but use of more precise instruments might uncover significant relationships or differences.

Summary

There are several observations which need to be emphasized or reiterated. The most pertinent is that the values measured by the Study of Values are seemingly unrelated to teacher success. Although the validity of administrative ratings for determining teacher success is open to question, the findings of this study and others indicate that the Values instrument cannot be used to distinguish characteristic values of successful teachers. What little disparity in findings between this study and others concerned with correlational analysis of values and success can be attributed to differences in research methods and populations. The differences in values of classroom teachers and principals uncovered in this study could be due to population differences. The principals and assistant principals were all men while the classroom teachers in the same population had a large majority of women. The present study was not concerned with this factor. The most significant finding of the present study emphasizes the value of experience in developing professional teaching competence.

APPENDIX

PEARSON PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATIONS: TEACHER SUCCESS CRITERIA AND VALUE SCORES

Professional Competencies	Theoretical	Economic	Aesthetic	Social	Political	Religious
Knowledge of Subject Matter and/or Teaching Areas	-.06	.03	.16*	.01	-.14*	.03
Preparation for Classroom Activities	-.03	-.05	.17*	-.01	-.10	-.00
Directing Discussion Groups	-.07	-.02	.15*	.02	-.09	-.04
Directing Other Learning Activities	-.05	-.01	.12*	.02	-.17*	.04
Establishing and Utilizing Classroom Routines	-.03	.03	.08	-.02	-.06	-.01
Organizing for Discipline	.00	.04	.00	-.05	.00	.01
Understanding the Individual	-.13*	-.00	.14*	-.01	-.07	.03
Attitude Toward Pupils	-.10	-.03	.11	.02	-.05	.03
Reaction to Criticism	-.06	.02	.09	-.04	-.09	.05
Word Usage	-.09	-.13*	.36*	-.04	-.11	-.06
Ability to Communicate in the Classroom	-.10	-.12	.21*	.03	-.09	-.00
Professional Ethics	-.13*	-.10	.10	.02	-.13*	.12
Total	-.09	-.02	.14*	-.02	-.09	.04

*Significant at .05 level.

PEARSON PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATIONS: TEACHER SUCCESS CRITERIA AND VALUE SCORES

Personal Traits and Qualities	Theoretical	Economic	Aesthetic	Social	Political	Religious
Personal Appearance	-.20*	-.03	.14*	-.13	-.05	.09
Poise and Confidence	-.07	.01	.18*	-.06	-.06	-.04
Voice	-.09	-.01	.18*	-.08	.00	-.05
Enthusiasm	-.03	-.04	.09	-.01	-.07	.02
Sense of Humor	-.06	.01	.02	-.05	.03	.04
Opinionation	-.07	-.06	.13*	.02	-.14*	.08
Dependability	-.07	.07	.02	.04	-.11	.03
Adaptability	-.01	.02	.08	-.00	-.08	-.00
Initiative	-.08	-.04	.17*	.04	-.10	-.03
Ability to Evaluate Self	-.09	-.05	.11	.10	-.16*	.06
Total	-.08	-.01	.15*	-.01	-.10	.01

*Significant at .05 level.

PEARSON PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATIONS: TEACHER SUCCESS CRITERIA AND VALUE SCORES

Relationships With Others	Theoretical	Economic	Aesthetic	Social	Political	Religious
Relationship With the Supervising Teacher	-.12*	-.02	.12*	-.03	-.09	.10
Relationship With Other Faculty Members	-.11	.05	.05	-.03	-.09	.09
Total	-.12*	.01	.09	-.03	-.09	.10

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Allport, Gordon W., Pattern and Growth in Personality, New York, Holt, Rhinehart and Winston, Inc., 1961.

_____, Personality: A Psychological Interpretation, New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1937.

Allport, Gordon W., Philip E. Vernon and Gardner Lindzey, Manual: Study of Values, Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1960.

_____, Study of Values, Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1960.

Anderson, T. W., An Introduction to Multivariate Statistical Analysis, New York, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958.

Biddle, Bruce J. and William J. Ellena, Contemporary Research on Teacher Effectiveness, Chicago, Holt, Rhinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964.

Borg, Walter R., Educational Research: An Introduction, New York, David McKay Company, Inc., 1936.

Boros, Oscar Krisen (ed.), The Sixth Mental Measurements Yearbook, Highland Park, New Jersey, The Gryphon Press, 1965.

Childs, J. L , Education and Morals, New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1950.

Combs, Arthur W., The Professional Education of Teachers, Boston, Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1965.

Combs, Arthur W. and Donald Snygg, Individual Behavior, New York, Harper and Row, 1959.

Cooley, William W., and Paul R. Lohnes, Multivariate Procedures for the Behavioral Sciences, New York, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962.

Corey, Fay L., Values of Future Teachers, New York, Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia, 1955.

Hartford, Ellis Ford, Moral Values in Education, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1958.

Jacob, Philip E., Changing Values in College, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1957.

Kearney, Nolan C., A Teacher's Professional Guide, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1958.

Krathwohl, David R., Benjamin S. Bloom and Bertram B. Masiz, Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: The Classification of Educational Goals, New York, David McKay Company, Inc., 1964.

Lindquist, E. F., Statistical Analysis in Educational Research, Dallas, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1940.

Maslow, Abraham, Motivation and Personality, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1954.

Mouly, George J., Psychology for Effective Teaching, Dallas, Holt, Rhinehart and Winston, Inc., 1968.

McNemar, Quinn, Psychological Statistics, New York, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1965.

Rokeach, Milton, Beliefs, Attitudes and Values, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1968.

Rugg, Harold O., The Great Technology, New York, John Day Company, 1933.

Scott, William A., Values and Organizations, Chicago, Rand McNally and Company, 1965.

Shane, Harold G. and E. T. McSwain, Evaluation and the Elementary Curriculum, New York, Holt, Rhinehart and Winston, Inc., 1958.

Spranger, Eduard, Types of Men, translated by P. J. V. Pigors, Halle, Max Niemeyer, 1928.

Stern, G. S., M. I. Stein and B. S. Bloom, Methods in Personality Assessment, Glencoe, Illinois, The Free Press, 1956.

Walker, Helen M. and Joseph Lev, Elementary Statistical Methods, New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1958.

Winer, B. J., Statistical Principles in Experimental Design, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1962.

Articles

Anderson, H. M., "Study of Certain Criteria of Teaching Effectiveness," Journal of Experimental Education, XXIII (1954), 47-71.

Andrews, John H. and Alan F. Brown, "Can Principals Exclude Their Own Personality Characteristics When They Rate Their Teachers?," Educational Administration and Supervision, XLV (July, 1959), 234-242.

Barr, A. S., "The Measurement and Prediction of Teaching Efficiency; A Summary of Investigations," Journal of Experimental Education, XVI (June, 1948), 203-263.

Barr, A. S. and Robert E. Jones, "The Measurement and Prediction of Teacher Efficiency," Review of Educational Research, XXVIII (June, 1958), 256-264.

Biber, Barbara, "Problems of Values and Measures in Evaluation of Teaching," Educational Leadership, XV (1958), 213-217.

Borg, W. R., "Personality and Interest Measures as Related to Criteria of Instructor Effectiveness," Journal of Educational Research, L (1957), 701-709.

Bowie, Lucile B. and Gerthon Morgan, "Personal Values and Verbal Behavior of Teachers," The Journal of Experimental Education, XXX (June, 1962), 337-345.

Brain, George, "Evaluating Teacher Effectiveness," NEA Journal, LIV (February, 1965), 35-36.

Calabria, F. M., "Characteristics of Effective Teachers," Educational Research Bulletin, XXXIX (1960), 92-100.

Carlile, A. B., "Predicting Performance in the Teaching Profession," Journal of Educational Research, XLVII (May, 1954), 641-658.

Cole, David L., "The Prediction of Teaching Performance," Journal of Educational Research, LIV (May, 1961), 345-348.

Combs, Arthur W., "Can We Measure Good Teaching: Objective Measurement is Impossible," NEA Journal, LIII (January, 1964), 34-36, 73.

Densford, John P., "Value Theory as Basic to a Philosophy of Education," History of Education Quarterly, III (June, 1963), 102-106.

Evans, K. M., "A Critical Survey of Methods of Assessing Teacher Ability," British Journal of Educational Psychology, XXI (June, 1951), 89-95.

Fattu, Nicholas A., "What Research Says About Teacher Effectiveness," National Education Association, L (October, 1961), 55-56.

Foshay, Arthur W. and Max R. Goodson, "Some Reflections on Cooperative Action Research," Issues in Curriculum Development, edited by Marvin D. Alcorn and James M. Linley, World Book Company, New York (1959), 348-356.

Ginsburg, Sol W. and John L. Herma, "Values and Their Relationship to Psychiatric Principles and Practice," American Journal of Psychotherapy, VII(July, 1953), 554.

Gowan, John C., "Intercorrelations and Factor Analyses of Tests Given to Teaching Candidates," Journal of Experimental Education, XXVII (September, 1958), 1-22.

_____, John C., "A Summary of the Intensive Study of Twenty Highly Selected Elementary Women Teachers," Journal of Experimental Education, XXVI (December, 1957), 115-124.

Guba, E. G. and J. W. Getzels, "Personality and Teacher Effectiveness: A Problem in Theoretical Research," Journal of Educational Psychology, XLVI (1955), 330-344.

Guy, George V., Willard B. Spalding and Howard E. Westcott, "The Role of Values in Teacher Education," The Journal of Teacher Education, XII (March, 1961), 12.

Hale, Peter P., "Isolating Objective Factors for the Teaching Profession," Journal of Educational Research, XLVIII (March, 1955), 497-507.

Hampton, N. D., "An Analysis of Supervisory Ratings of Elementary Teachers Graduated from Iowa State Teachers College," Journal of Experimental Education, XX (December, 1951), 180-215

Jones, Margaret L., "An Analysis of Certain Aspects of Teaching Ability," Journal of Experimental Education, XXV (1956), 153-180.

Joyce, Bruce, "An Orientation Toward Values in Teacher Education," The Journal of Teaching Education, XII (December, 1961), 463-465.

Lawhead, Victor B., "Values Through Identification," Educational Leadership, XXI (May, 1964), 515-518.

Levin, H., T. L. Hilton and Gloria L. Leiderman, "Studies of Teacher Behavior," Journal of Experimental Education, XXVI (1957), 81-81.

Manwiller, L. V., "Expectations Regarding Teachers," Journal of Experimental Education, XXI (1958), 315-354.

Maslow, Abraham, "Psychological Data and Value Theory," New Knowledge in Human Values, edited by Abraham Maslow, New York, Harper and Brothers (1959), pp. 119-136.

Medley, Donald M. and Harold E. Mitzel, "A Tentative Framework for the Study of Effective Teacher Behavior," Journal of Experimental Education, XXX (June, 1962), 317-320.

Mitzel, Harold E., "Can We Measure Good Teaching Objectively: Recent Research Holds Promise That We Can," NEA Journal, LIII (January, 1964), 35-36.

_____, "Teacher Effectiveness," Encyclopedia of Educational Research, (Third Edition), New York, MacMillan and Company (1960), pp. 1481-1485.

Paschal, Billy J., "How Children Learn Values," Educational Digest, XXXIII (May, 1968), 49-51.

Perkins, Theodore F., "Research Relating to the Problem of Values," California Journal of Elementary Education, XXIII (May, 1955), 236.

Prince, R., "Individual Values and Administrative Effectiveness," Administrator's Notebook, VI (December, 1957), 1-4.

Rabinowitz, W. and R. M. W. Travers, "Problems of Defining and Assessing Teacher Effectiveness," Educational Theory, III (1953), 212-219.

Raths, James, "Values and Valuing," Educational Leadership, XXI (May, 1964), 543-546.

Riccio, Anthony C. and Herman J. Peters, "The Study of Values and the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory," Educational Research Bulletin, XXXIX (April, 1960), 101-103.

Rolfe, J. F., "The Measurement of Teaching Ability," Journal of Experimental Education, XIV (September, 1945), 52-74.

Rupiper, Omer John, "A Psychometric Evaluation of Experienced Teachers," The Journal of Educational Research, LV (May, 1962), 369-371.

Ryans, David G., "The Criteria of Teaching Effectiveness," Journal of Educational Research, XLII (May, 1949), 690-699.

_____, "The Investigation of Teacher Characteristics," Education Record, XXXIV (1953), 371-396.

Seagoe, May V., "Prediction of In-Service Success in Teaching," Journal of Educational Research, XXXIX (May, 1946), 658-663.

Tanner, William C., Jr., "Personality Bases in Teacher Selection," Phi Delta Kappan, XXV (April, 1954), 271-277.

"Teacher Effectiveness Research: Problems and Status," California Journal of Educational Research, IX (1958), 148-158, 166.

Willard, Ruth A., "A Study of the Relationship Between the Valued-Behaviors of Selected Teachers and the Learning Experiences Provided in Their Classrooms," Journal of Educational Research, XLIX (September, 1958), 45-51.

Witty, Paul A., "Some Characteristics of the Effective Teacher," Educational Administration and Supervision, XXXVI (April, 1950), 193-208.

Unpublished Material

Billingsly, Leon Commodore, "Characteristics of Teacher Effectiveness," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Education, University of Arkansas, Little Rock, 1961.

Briggs, Kenneth R., "Student Teacher Values and Behavior Patterns," unpublished doctoral dissertation, School of Education, North Texas State University, Denton, 1966.

White, Jack, "The Relationship Between Values and Success in Student Teaching," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Education, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1966.

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, "Convictions, Beliefs and Values," Perceiving, Behaving, Becoming, 1962 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Chapter 13, Washington, D. C., Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1962.

Brubacher, John (ed.), The Public Schools and Spiritual Values, Seventh Yearbook of the John Dewey Society, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1944.

Educational Policies Commission, Moral and Spiritual Values in the Public Schools, Washington, D. C., National Education Association, 1951.

Gage, N. L., Handbook of Research on Teaching, A Project of the American Educational Research Association, A Department of the National Educational Association, Chicago, Rand McNally and Company, 1963.

Guba, E. G. and C. E. Bidwell, Administrative Relationships: Teacher Effectiveness, Teacher Satisfaction and Administrative Behavior, Chicago, Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1957.

Maslow, Abraham, "Deficiency Motivation and Growth Motivation," Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, edited by Marshall R. Jones, Lincoln, Nebraska, University of Nebraska Press, 1955.

Raths, Louis E., "Sociological Knowledge and Needed Curriculum Research," Research Frontiers in the Study of Children's Learning, edited by James B. Macdonald, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, School of Education, University of Wisconsin, 1960.

Ryans, David G., Characteristics of Teachers, Washington, D. C., American Council on Education, 1960.

Simon, Sidney, "Value Development: A High Sense of Individualization," Concern for the Individual in Student Teaching, 42nd Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching, Part II, Dubuque, Iowa, William C. Brown Company, Inc., 1963.